1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATI	ES DISTRICT COURT
7	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9	McKesson Corp., a Delaware Corp.,	No. C-07-5715 WDB
10	Plaintiff,	
11	V.	ORDER RE MARCH 12, 2008, HEARING
<ul><li>12</li><li>13</li></ul>	Familymeds Group, Inc., f/k/a Drugmax, Inc., a Connecticut corporation,	
<ul><li>14</li><li>15</li></ul>	Defendants.	
16 17	Familymeds Group, Inc., f/k/a Drugmax, Inc., a Connecticut corporation,	
18	Counterclaimant v.	
<ul><li>19</li><li>20</li></ul>	McKesson Corp., a Delaware corporation,	
21	Counterdefendant.	
<ul><li>22</li><li>23</li></ul>	Familymeds, Inc., a Connecticut corporation,	
24	Cross-complainant v.	
<ul><li>25</li><li>26</li></ul>	McKesson Corp., a Delaware corporation,	
27	Cross-defendant.	
-		

27

28

The Court wants the <u>clients</u> in this case to understand what is driving the orders the Court entered orally at the initial case management conference on March 12, 2008, and that are summarized below. One of the Court's responsibilities to the litigants is to do what it can to keep litigation transaction costs from growing out of all proportion to the amounts at stake under the claims in the case. The Court also has a duty, imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to do what it can to promote the "just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action."

The procedure the Court has ordered is informed by responsiveness to these merging duties and by the Court's sense that what is at the center of this case is a matter of accounting that parties who are proceeding in good faith should be able to digest in a straightforward exchange of information.

For several years, the parties and their predecessors have been involved in a high volume business relationship in which some \$170,000,000 has changed hands. It beggars the Court's imagination that, against that background of deep experience and considerable business sophistication, the parties cannot figure out what amounts remain owing. We don't need a lawsuit; we need ethical business people to determine responsibly what is owed and to get that amount promptly paid.

So, between now and the end of April, the parties must sit down in the same room with one another, accompanied by appropriately knowledgeable persons, and try (really) to resolve these accounting matters. If the parties fail, after trying in good faith, to reach an agreement, the Court will move this case toward an adjudicated disposition as fast as the mandates of due process permit.

Before Wednesday, April 30, 2008, the parties must exchange information about the disputed accounts and must meet to discuss settlement of the parties' claims. The parties must produce all representatives necessary to facilitate this

exchange of information including, without limitation, those familiar with the necessary computer systems, billing processes, and rules applicable to pricing.

The Court hereby enters a PROTECTIVE ORDER pursuant to which all information exchanged among the parties pursuant to this Order must be treated as CONFIDENTIAL unless and until otherwise ordered by the Court.

The Court prohibits the parties from filing additional motions or conducting formal discovery until after April 30, 2008.

By Monday April 28, 2008, at <u>noon</u>, the parties must file a joint case management conference statement describing the status of the parties' efforts.

On Wednesday, April 30, 2008, at 3:00 p.m., the Court will conduct a follow up case management conference. Any party may appear by telephone and must call the Court's staff by April 28, 2008, at (510)-637-3324 to arrange to appear by telephone.

The Court CONTINUES the hearing on McKesson's Motion to Dismiss to Wednesday, April 30, 2008, at 3:00 p.m. The hearing will go forward following the status conference unless McKesson has withdrawn its Motion prior to that time.

The Court ORDERS counsel to deliver a copy of this Order promptly to their clients.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 13, 2008

Copies to: parties, wdb, stats

United States Magistrate Judge